# Urban Construction Initiative Annual Meeting Minutes Hampton Roads Convention Center – City of Hampton July 27 and 28, 2011

The Urban Construction Initiative Annual Meeting was hosted by the City of Hampton at the Hampton Roads Convention Center.

# JULY 27th TRAINING COURSE:

As shown in the 2010 UCI Satisfaction Survey and discussed at our March UCI Tri-Annual meeting, we provided a full day training session in advance of the traditional UCI Annual meeting business and technical items. The July 27<sup>th</sup> the technical training session was a 1-day National Highway Institute (NHI) course instructed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on the FHWA Contract Administration Core Curriculum.

Approximately 60 people attended the training which represented 13 different localities, the FHWA and VDOT.

A group dinner event was held later that evening as a kickoff to the next day's annual meeting.

# JULY 28th ANNUAL MEETING:

**LAD Office Hours:** Prior to the beginning of the UCI Annual Meeting on the 28th, from 8:15am until 9:45am, VDOT Local Assistance Division held office hours to discuss LAD programs and processes.

All follow up and Q&A information is included at the end of the meeting minutes. The meeting attendance list can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'Attendance List 7-27-11'.

#### I. Welcome - Opening Remarks:

Lynn Allsbrook, City of Hampton welcomed everyone to the City of Hampton. Jennifer DeBruhl, VDOT Local Assistance Division began the UCI Annual Meeting by outlining the agenda for the day and introduced various new VDOT members that have joined the program. She also introduced Mr. Rick Walton, VDOT's Chief of Policy and Environment and Mr. Dennis Heuer, VDOT's Hampton Roads District Administrator. She also introduced Mr. Kent Shelton with the City of Danville and announced that the City has submitted a letter of intent to join the Urban Construction

Initiative in July of FY2013 and shared that the Cities of Purcellville and Chesapeake have executed UCI Program Agreements and have become UCI Member Municipalities effective July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011.

### II. Business items:

#### A. Local Government's Integral Role in Transportation Solutions:

**Mike Estes,** VDOT Local Assistance Division presented information on the Governor's 2011 Transportation Funding Package, 2011 General Assembly Legislative changes, VDOT Organizational alignment, program delivery and other aspects of VDOT's Business Plan.

Mr. Estes also updated the group on the latest information regarding the VDOT Revenue Sharing Program. The presentation included some of the recent legislative changes, the recommended guidelines for funding, and the tentative timeline for submission and approval. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'Items of Interest 7-28-11'.

#### B. <u>UCI Certification Update:</u>

**Phil Pullen,** City of Virginia Beach presented the City's process for obtaining internal support for applying to the VDOT UCI Certification program. The City has submitted an application to become certified. He discussed some of the challenges and opportunities that he has faced internally through the process and had identified lessons learned for gaining internal support. The City's application is currently under review by VDOT.

**Todd Halacy,** VDOT Local Assistance Division discussed the review process from VDOT's perspective and outlined the internal challenges and opportunities that have transpired with this new certification program. LAD has had the opportunity to gain reaffirmation of the program by the submission of VA Beach's application. This has also been a great opportunity to expose the UCI Program to staff that has not been previously exposed. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'UCI Certification Update 7-28-11'.

#### C. 2011 Satisfaction Survey:

**Drew Williams**, City of Harrisonburg provided the results of the 2011 Satisfaction Survey that measures the qualitative program success. Responses from both localities and VDOT trended downwards from previous years which seem to be a direct reflection of the budgetary realities at state and local levels. The survey also reflected that 35.3% of respondents are interested in pursuing certification and that good communication is still occurring between VDOT and localities. The survey results are attached for your review under separate pdf file labeled 'UCI Satisfaction Survey 7-28-11'.

#### D. UCI Workgroup Update:

**David Jarman,** City of Virginia Beach presented to the group the accomplishments and next steps of the UCI Workgroup since the March UCI Tri-Annual Mtg. He discussed the workgroups goal to create standardized contract templates for RFP's for professional and non-professional services, the purchase of goods, and equipment. He outlined how the workgroup has created an RFP insert that can be utilized by localities to meet federal/ state requirements and clearly defined what qualifies for non-professional services.

He announced that the workgroup has also started using a free message board secured service that is accessible by UCI Municipalities to share information. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'UCI Workgroup Update 7-28-11'.

#### E. Program Performance and Path Forward for UCI:

**Jennifer DeBruhl,** VDOT Local Assistance Division discussed performance data and reporting for locally administered projects. She recognized potential roadblocks to documenting performance and identified possible solutions. She also talked about the UCI Workgroup's future role in the performance initiative and asked the group to identify tools and resources that the workgroup could create that would assist local governments and VDOT accomplish what is most important. The Q&A's can be found under section VII of these meeting minutes. The presentation is also available under separate pdf file labeled 'Prog Perf 7-28-11'.

## III. Lunch

#### IV. Technical Items

#### A. Every Day Counts Initiative:

**Iris Rodriguez**, FHWA presented to the group an overview of the FHWA's Every Day Counts Initiative (EDC). She outlined some of the highlights of the EDC program by defining the three basic program areas: 1) shortening project delivery (project development), 2) accelerating project delivery (Procurement), and 3) accelerating technology deployment. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'EDC 7-28-11'.

#### B. North Main Street Project:

**Brandon Steele**, Town of Blacksburg shared his experience with communications and public outreach for the town's Main Street construction project. He outlined the keys for success when working with citizens, business owners, students, contractors and other agencies. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'Blacksburg 7-28-11'

#### C. Erickson/ Stone Spring Project:

**Julie Hartman**, City of Harrisonburg presented an overview of the Erickson/ Stone Spring project that is a major multi-phase project for the City. She shared the many challenges that have been encountered during the construction of the different phases of the project. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'Harrisonburg 7-28-11'

#### D. VDOT Tier I/ Tier II Project Delivery:

**Samuel Hayes**, VDOT Richmond District gave a brief overview of a major change to the VDOT project development requirements to assist in streamlining project delivery. He outlined how VDOT is applying a two-tiered approach to project oversight. Tier I (No VDOT Central Office Oversight) are for projects that are considered to be smaller, less complicated that have fewer risks, fewer ROW impacts and fewer construction impacts than Tier 2. Tier 2 (requires full VDOT Central Office Oversight) are projects that typically have more complicated MOT plans and more complex construction issues. There are typically more ROW impacts. More details, including the presentation and supporting information can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'VDOT TierI\_II 7-28-11'.

#### E. Newport News Best Practice:

**Jeffrey Everton**, City of Newport News demonstrated the City's Civil Construction Inspection Program. The program is a web-based application that allows inspectors in the field to update activities, diaries, and materials remotely on a daily, weekly or monthly basis. The City received recognition for this program as a best practice in a recent FHWA National Review Team Audit. The presentation can be found under separate pdf file labeled 'Newport News 7-28-11'

#### V. General Discussion/ Next Meeting Topic:

**Todd Halacy**, VDOT Local Assistance Division, closed the meeting with a reminder that the Year End Reports are due to LAD by August 31<sup>st</sup>.

Also, the UCI Workgroup Meeting scheduled for Monday, August 8<sup>th</sup>, was cancelled and the workgroup will reconvene in September.

#### VI. Wrap Up/ Close:

**Todd Halacy** closed the meeting with a special thank you to the presenters and to the City of Hampton for hosting the meetings the last couple of days.

The *next meeting will be Thursday, November 17<sup>th</sup>*, 2011. We need a volunteer to host this meeting.

#### VII. Follow Up and Q&A Information:

Throughout the day there were questions asked for follow up or for information purposes. To document all that was asked, below we have tried to capture the follow up and Q&A information. If any further information is requested, please contact Todd Halacy at 804-786-3438.

#### Mike's Presentation:

- 1) Q: The Revenue Sharing program should be able to be used to supplement maintenance funds.
  - A: VA Code Section 33.1-23.05 states that Revenue Sharing funds can be used: "...to improve, construct, or reconstruct the highway system within such county, city, or town". Changes to allow for maintenance projects would require a legislative change. More information is available at the following link: <a href="http://www.ctb.virginia.gov/resources/2011/apr/Agenda\_Item\_7\_RevenueSharingGuidelines2011.pdf">http://www.ctb.virginia.gov/resources/2011/apr/Agenda\_Item\_7\_RevenueSharingGuidelines2011.pdf</a>
- 2) Q: HSIP Policy regarding the 1 year to obligate and 4 years to construct. VDOT was in the process of evaluating the obligation timeline for HSIP Projects. What is the status?
  - A: VDOT is still evaluating the timeline and will provide guidance if revised.

#### Jennifer's Presentation:

- Q: What is VDOT's FY12 on-time/ on-budget goal?
   A: The FY12 goals are not yet available. However, the FY11 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report and FY11 goals are available at the following link:
   <a href="http://www.virginiadot.org/info/resources/VDOT\_3rd\_qtr\_FY\_2011\_QuarterlyReportPRINT.pdf">http://www.virginiadot.org/info/resources/VDOT\_3rd\_qtr\_FY\_2011\_QuarterlyReportPRINT.pdf</a>
- Q: For the UCI message board that was discussed in David Jarman's presentation. Who will monitor and answer the posted questions?A: Currently the workgroup is discussing the protocol to answer posted questions and to validate the responses.
- Q: Will VDOT's implementation of a new Financial Management System (Cardinal) allow localities to have access to VDOT's systems?
   A: Cardinal may not afford additional opportunities for localities accessibility into VDOT systems. However VDOT is revamping their internal portal system, which may soon allow localities to gain better access to VDOT's systems.
- 4) Q: Can the locality have the access to get information directly? To track and view?
  - A: Locality access to VDOT systems is still being discussed.

The following comments were received in response to Jennifer's questions regarding the direction of the UCI Workgroup. These comments will be discussed with the workgroup at the September meeting.

- 1) Response time through VDOT and the localities needs to be considered when looking at performance measures and data.
- 2) It would be useful for the localities to have access to the actual obligation strategy that is being utilized by VDOT. It is important for all to be working off of the same data.
- 3) It would be helpful for the localities and VDOT to develop a glossary of terms.
- 4) The UCI Workgroup can develop tools that work to help VDOT and the Localities to deliver the project and to develop performance measure tools.
- 5) Recommend splitting the workgroup up into tow groups (1) technical and (2) programmatic.